Table of Contents

Relationships
page 4

The Self is an Illusion
page 14

Inability to Consent is a Poor Argument Against Procreation
page 26

Self Expression
page 33

The Mischaracterization of Nihilism
page 40

Biological Warfare
page 51

Self Deception
page 64

Eulavism
page 82

Solutions to Suffering
page 88

Good and Bad
page 98

Miscellany
page 103

Formative Events and Truth
page 104

I just wrote this short book to discuss a few topics without having to produce a second edition of On Efilism, and without having to delay publication of that book because these topics are not important enough to justify delaying publication. It is more important that people understand that there is no good reason to procreate than it is that they understand that consent is a poor argument against procreation. These finer points of contention do not justify extending the length of On Efilism or of delaying publication and a 2nd edition would mean that purchasers of the 1st edition would feel cheated because they will now be obligated to purchase two copies of the same book in order to read the new arguments.

The arguments within this book should be easy enough to comprehend on their own, but reading On Efilism will provide a great deal of insight into my thought processes, and may be needed for some people to understand some sections of this book. I have done my best to fully explain every argument within this book so that nothing else needs to be read in order to understand said arguments but you never know, some arguments just might not click for some people without having read On Efilism.

Relationships

Relationships humans form with one another, being such a prominent aspect of life, deserve to be addressed first. Within On Efilism, I touched upon in what way(s) the existence of even a single individual necessitates that others suffer in order to maintain the existence of said individual. However, I did fail to explain in what way(s) personal relationships are intrinsically a source of suffering.

Before I begin, I must say that the following facts were revealed to me through reading the book "Ever Deeper Honesty", to which I am deeply indebted. I highly recommend this work for its thorough treatment of the subjects upon which it touches.

As I feel we should all be capable of openly acknowledging all relationships are founded upon all parties attempting to extract something from the relationship; whether it be money, sex, validation, attention, etc., and all of these various things are simply means of inducing pleasant neurological states. At bottom, relationships are a means of satisfying our addiction to pleasant sensations.

This is true for all relationships: parental, spousal, business, friendship, etc. If all parties concerned were not interested in extracting something from the

relationship, then they would withdraw from it. This is evidently true even in the case of seemingly "selfless" and "one-sided" interactions such as: a charity donating to end child starvation, someone giving money to a beggar, someone volunteering to assist those in need, etc., because, even within these "selfless" interactions (relationships) the person(s) who is/are donating their time, energy and or resources is/are still being rewarded with pleasant neurological sensations. They feel good for doing it.

All relationships, all interactions, are transactional whether we are inclined to acknowledge it or not. What is amusing is that people subtly state that relationships are transactional without realizing that they are doing so. They will say things such as: "being with you is amazing" or "I've never felt so good in my life as I do when I'm with you" or "you're so fun to hang out with" or "it was really nice seeing you", etc. So people admit that they are involved with others because they are receiving pleasant neurological sensations from interacting with them, i.e., they are tacitly admitting that their involvement with others is contingent upon receiving (or at least potentially receiving) something to induce a neurological state that they desire. People should be capable of openly stating that relationships are transactional without being shamed for doing so. Probably the closest most people come to openly

saying that they are only dealing with someone because they are getting what they want is when they say "I'm with you (or I love you) because you make me happy".

Of course there is nothing inherently wrong with people interacting with one another in order to experience pleasure, it is selfish but it is not inherently harmful, i.e., it does not inherently produce suffering. However, real world conditions practically necessitate that all relationships produce suffering.

Not all demands are capable of instantaneous or complete satisfaction, and so suffering is produced. For instance, potato farmers may have been incapable of meeting the demand of a potato crisp manufacturer and consequently consumer demand was not capable of satisfaction and consumers suffer. Another example is when a person fails to sexually satisfy their partner. Inability to satisfy one's partner has created more suffering than can be told; countless relationships have fallen into a downward spiral and ended over sexual inadequacy. People are often incapable of satisfying the emotional needs of family members, friends, partners, acquaintances, etc., and this inability to satisfy the needs of others often creates enough suffering to produce suicide, murder, divorce, people completely cutting ties with one another, depression,

etc.

No set of circumstances exists in which a relationship can be maintained (in a perfect state) in perpetuity; necessarily some amount, some degree, of suffering will be inflicted, intentionally or unintentionally. No relationship is exactly as all participants want it to be at all times; therefore some suffering exists within all relationships at some time and in fact nearly all relationships are unlikely to be exactly as all participants would like them to be even most of the time; therefore we are correct in saying that all relationships produce some suffering most of the time, even if said suffering is slight.

In fact, most relationships clearly are not valuable enough to maintain to most people because they are not maintained over the entirety of any of the participant's lifetimes. The vast majority of relationships with coworkers, acquaintances, friends, and even family members and romantic partners will be gradually or suddenly ended because the participants in the relationships will become incompatible as their personalities change over time.

I could also get into all of the suffering that happens within relationships as a consequence of person A treating person B poorly because they had a rough day, week, month or even year and how suffering totally unrelated to the relationship can lead to the destruction of relationships because of

stress, depression, anger, etc., over any number of issues that could have happened at any time. However, for the sake of brevity, I will not get into all of that and will simply acknowledge the reality that many relationships are ruined by one person taking out their frustration, stress, sadness, etc., (brought upon by any number of things) upon their friend, coworker, family member, significant other, etc.

Relationships can be sabotaged very easily without anyone having any intention of doing so. The best case scenario is that you find someone with whom you're perfectly compatible and you both develop in the same direction and so you are on the same wavelength throughout the duration of the relationship, which, assuming the aforesaid, should be the entirety of the lives of the participants. If I get along perfectly with even a coworker, I would want to maintain that relationship indefinitely even if we are not in daily contact with one another.

It is easier to maintain a superficial relationship because fewer points of contention, fewer points of divergence, reveal themselves because you are less intimately acquainted. A romantic entanglement is nearly impossible to maintain in a perfect state, exactly as all participants wish it to be, because all people involved will become intimately acquainted,

and so more potential sources of conflict emerge. It is so unlikely that two people (let alone more) so intimately acquainted with one another will develop in the same direction and will maintain the same conception of how their relationship ought to be over the course of decades.

The divergence of conception of the ideal relationship (how each partner envisions the ideal relationship), which naturally emerges over time is why so many initially strong relationships flounder. They get together because at the time they are the perfect match for one another but as time passes they become uncomfortable with one another and they dissolve the relationship; this is part of the reason why divorces are so common within highly developed nations. Within impoverished nations, romantic entanglements are still largely at a superficial level and so the marriage can survive for decades without many issues. However, within highly developed nations, we have promoted the notion that romantic entanglements should be based upon deep and authentic appreciation for every aspect of the partner's personality and consequently few romantic relationships are capable of surviving that demand indefinitely.

Realistically, the best case scenario for any romantic entanglement is that both partners are fine with a relationship in which the deepest depths are

not plumbed and fewer points of contention become problems for the survival of the relationship.

However, this scenario means that you are settling for an (ultimately) inadequate and incomplete (due to its shallowness) romantic relationship, which fails to satisfy all of your needs, and so cheating is more likely because you will be seeking out new partners with whom you can identify on these deeper levels with which you're incapable of identifying with your significant other.

Relationships are emotional dependency upon others; you are relying upon others to provide you with whatever it is that produces whatever particular neurological sensations you are seeking. You are chasing an addiction and all addictions are unnecessary because life is unnecessary. Addictions always cause suffering because they are not capable of complete satisfaction at all times; consequently, you will suffer and you will probably cause others to suffer because you are in pain and lash out.

Not getting what you feel that you need from relationships creates far more suffering than not becoming entangled within any relationships whatsoever. The pain of isolation is less than the pain of being within tumultuous – all relationships, being based upon ever-changing human whims, are definitionally tumultuous – relationships. Of course,

the degree to which you will suffer within a relationship is based upon how invested you are and to what extent things do not go as you'd like them to, but if you're not involved with anyone, there is no suffering that can come to you as a consequence of dealing with or being isolated from them.

Not getting into any relationships of any kind is the safest bet as regards enduring and inflicting suffering. Of course in order to exist (unless you are totally isolated and completely self-sufficient) you are obliged to enter into some relations with man even if only indirectly (e.g., with people who manufacture your shoes, clothes, home, who maintain the roadways, etc.), and so, to exist is to create suffering, even if only inadvertently.

As a final note, I also want to touch briefly upon how we are all forced to interact with people whom we dislike. This is quite a common problem, I am sure everyone reading this has been obliged by circumstance to deal with someone they found to be irritating or repugnant. Of course, within these relationships you are best off hiding your true feelings about them, because the consequences of revealing said feelings will be worse than tolerating them, so you are guaranteed to suffer either way. Common examples are: abusive romantic relationships, coworkers, roommates and frequently

encountered acquaintances.

In summary, it is best to avoid deep entanglements and to avoid any and all relationships if possible. Your existence will necessarily create some suffering, but you have no need to become deeply invested in relationships with others, and deeply invested in by others because all relationships are inadequate, imperfect, and guaranteed to create suffering, and the more that people are invested in relationships, the more they will suffer. So by investing deeply into a relationship and by being the point of investment for others you are enduring and creating a great deal of suffering for yourself and others, suffering which is not even required for you to continue your existence. Only the indirect relationships and very shallow coworker relationships need to be maintained in order to perpetuate your existence.

Relationships are merely means to ends (experiencing pleasure or fulfilling essential biological needs), and those ends do not need to exist or be satisfied, with which to begin. You do not need to get whatever it is that you are getting from any relationship, even from those relationships necessary to continue your existence, because you do not need to continue existing.

As amusing as it may seem to the reader, after completing the entirety of the writing, and editing of

this essay – that is to say that with full knowledge of the nature and consequences of all relationships, but especially romantic entanglements – I still became hopelessly infatuated with someone. The suffering that I predicted did in fact befall me, and I was interested in her solely out of a desire to produce pleasant neurological sensations. I was selfish and one could fairly state that I dehumanized the object of my desire.

Do not imagine that you are immunized from giving into your in-built biological urges simply because you're aware of them and the consequences of giving into them. We are a species of hypocrites. This is so true that the label is universally applicable and thus meaningless as it does not describe anything uncommon, rare or unique and no one is special for being a hypocrite.

Interacting with others can only be the result of a desire to experience pleasure and that desire can only reinforce your desire to live. Avoid all relationships.

The Self is an Illusion

This is another topic upon which I briefly touched within On Efilism. The self is an illusion in that "you" (as you presently are) do not exist for more than a moment. You are not "you" from ten years ago, ten hours ago or even ten minutes or seconds ago and the "you", the "I", which exists now will not persist indefinitely. In an absolute sense, you exist only moment-to-moment and "you", your conception of yourself, is merely a loose fiction to tie together your perception or conception of yourself (drawn from memories of past events) with how you are in this moment. The notion of the self is an attempt to make sense of our existence, our existence referring to the being that exists as this sentence is read and not the being which existed ten minutes prior to reading this, or the hypothetical being which will exist ten minutes in the future.

I am not myself from even the day before, those psychological states, I cannot perfectly recall and cannot exactly experience again because they were produced by too many factors to even know of. So no particular state of mind could be exactly replicated (unless completely accurate and full physiological data regarding the subject were available at the time that the sensations were

experienced). I am only "myself" from the past, the past is only relevant, in that my present condition is a product of prior events; the connection between past and present is purely causal and material, not something magical.

There is no "I" above or outside of reality, there is no "I" above or outside of time. Like everything within our universe, I am a product of circumstance. We, like all animals, are reaction machines who are molded by past, present events and by our genetics. Of course, you are still the product of the same genome at 40 years of age as you were from conception and you have still got the same organs (unless some replacements have been transplanted in), and so on, but our organs undergo changes with the passage of time, our brains especially, so it can be said that we are not who we once were. Our brains are experiencing so much, they are undergoing so much change, that for many people the person that "they" were thirty years earlier is unrecognizable to them, and they cannot even begin to place themselves within "their" own shoes at that time; this is because in an absolute sense you are not "yourself". The self is a fiction and the only real continuity between person X at 5 years old, 40 years old, and 65 years old, is that they are the product of the same genome and it is the same set of organs (at the very least, the same brain, which is what we

would really define as ourselves, anyway) undergoing these different experiences over the course of life. Person Z in 1990, 2000, and 2060 is the same entity only in that they are the same genome and set of organs.

Of course, the events of the past shape who we become in that said events impact our organs (trauma and drug addiction are two extreme examples of organs, especially the brain, being impacted by events), but we do not exist within those events indefinitely. We are not who we were in the past because we do not exist within the same circumstances. We can't be the same entity because we do not exist at different times simultaneously, i.e., we do not exist at every moment of our lives simultaneously; existence is exclusively the here-and-now. I exist only as myself at this moment and no other.

That we are not the same as "we" once were is proven by the fact that most relationships dissolve with the passage of time, and innumerable promises made in earnest to others and to one's self are broken. We really are fundamentally different from "ourselves" at different points in time, especially as the distance, the gulf, in time widens.

The reason why our species developed a sense of self is hard to exactly pin down. Other animals are

aware of themselves and retain memory but whether any have developed a notion of self, of "I", is difficult to answer. I would say that part of the reason that our species developed a sense of self is because our memory is far better (aided largely by language and, as of the 20th century, technology which has allowed us to record and review real-world events) than other animals so we are more wrapped up in the past, and so we are always contemplating how "I" came to be so fundamentally different from myself at any particular point in time or how I have arrived at this point in life.

We also simply possess far more free time to consider such matters than do less intelligent animals, who are less adept at manipulating their environment and who are not afforded the time to reflect upon how they came to be in x circumstance; furthermore, they lack the capability to do so because they have not developed the tools – language and inner monologue – needed to conceive of and perceive existence as we have. All abstract concepts, such as the self, require language to describe and contemplate. Conversely, I can contemplate objects without any knowledge of language whatsoever.

The self is an abstraction. You are not identical to yourself from the past and in the important ways

(the neurological differences which actually impact our personality, our personality with which we identify, our personality which is the self), you are likely very different from yourself prior to various formative events such as: going through university, becoming a parent, moving to a new location, experiencing severe trauma, mentoring delinquent youths, being exposed to arguments which change your outlook upon something, etc. Even day-to-day or hour-to-hour, a person's mood can change dramatically due to any number of factors. Your behavior and thoughts at 9 am could be completely different from your behavior and thoughts at 2 pm due to something as seemingly trivial as an acquaintance you don't even know by name saying some kind words to you.

The self is just a tool to help us make sense of our lives and delude us into imagining that we are in control of ourselves. We do not want to admit that we are not actually in control of ourselves; that we are actually controlled by too many factors to list off, many of which are so subtle or which have such a minor impact (individually anyway, collectively many weak factors may combine to have a strong impact) that we are incapable of perceiving them.

We also emotionally invest ourselves in this concept of the self in order to conceptualize our lives as a triumph or tragedy. We love to tell stories

about how we have overcome adversity or about how tragic our lives still are or how great the entirety of our lives have been, etc. For some reason, which I cannot comprehend, these stories empower people to continue crawling through this nightmare reality upon the deluded notion that "their" story of whatever justifies the struggle for existence. These stories would not be possible, would not be sensible, if we did not strongly identify with "ourselves" from the past.

This delusion that we "are ourselves"* is the basis for invented meanings which empower people to convince themselves and others that suffering is acceptable. In a way, we are unfortunate for having the capacity to recollect and record our past because we are compelled to face it. We cannot just continue blindly through life like a wasp. Most people are too arrogant to look at their suffering and admit that it was all ultimately pointless and unnecessary. They do not want to acknowledge that life is replete with suffering, pointless and meaningless so these stories are essential for life addicts to continue the crawl, to continue existing.

The Ship of Theseus question is very relevant to the question of identity. The Ship of Theseus thought experiment asks whether or not a ship can truly be said to be the same ship if all of its constituent parts

are replaced. I would say that the answer to the question really depends upon how we would like to define the ship in question. If we say that ship ϒ is defined by being composed of its parts then, in an absolute sense, it ceases to be ship ϒ as soon as even the most trivial components are replaced. If we are defining ship ϒ by the role it fulfills and how it functions then it remains the same ship so long as these remain consistent. How we choose to define self will obviously determine whether or not a person who is ten years old can be said to be the same person at thirty years old.

As a species, we generally define individual animals (including other humans) as being the same person, entity, being, etc., if they have got the same genes and inhabit the same corpse irrespective of the innumerable biological (especially neurological and thus "psychological") changes which have occurred over any time-frame. So, according to most, I am the same person, entity, being, etc., that I was twenty years ago and will be the same person, entity, being, etc., in another twenty years because I possess the same genes and inhabit what could be regarded as the same corpse.**

We are regarded as the same entities that "we" were as fetuses and as infants, in spite of the facts that we possess no memories of those times and that our consciousness was not as it is now. In no

respect which is of significance to myself, did "I" exist at least until about three or four years of age and I – the entity writing this – really do not identify with myself from even a few years prior to writing this very sentence. The latter statement may seem radical, but the former statement, I feel, is widely held. No one really imagines that "they" existed as a fetus or an infant, etc., though we are all aware that those developmental stages were prerequisites for the existence of our current forms; this is because nothing with which we identify has survived from these times. The memories, perception/conception of reality, thought processes, etc., from our earliest years are completely unknown. As a fetus and even in the earliest years of life, the brain is incapable of being subjected to or producing the neurological activity (consciousness) which we regard as the self. We are capable of nociception even as twenty-week-old fetuses, but we are not experiencing and regarding reality as we do once our capacity to recall the past is improved, and once we have begun to learn a language, and think in or of words and/images.

The entity which could only loosely be regarded as myself only began to exist at three years of age at the earliest. Only then, from what I can recall at this time, did I begin to think in words and images; these are the earliest times which I can recall; they're the

beginning of a continual experience which my brain, which "I", (whether I was inclined to do so or not) kept track of, i.e., memorized.

Notes:

* How could you currently be yourself from the past when you're distinct from them in many ways and when the past is itself an abstraction devoid of relevance to reality? The past, the previous state of reality, the previous arrangement of the cosmos, no longer exists, it is a conception invented to facilitate understanding of causality; of how it came to be that action A produced effect B. The past exists nowhere and therefore, in an absolute sense, nothing from the past, including "yourself", exists. The matter continues to exist but objects are continually altered (even if only at the atomic level) and thus aren't identical to themselves from any previous timeframe and so they're no longer the same objects which once existed. Of course, for colloquial use, there's no need to speak in these absolute terms.

** That a person inhabits the same corpse, the same body, is inaccurate in an absolute sense because things are always withering away and being replaced. Even your skeleton is gradually replaced, and over the course of about a decade, you will have

generated a full set of bones comprised entirely of new material.

Conclusion:

Everything is undergoing continual development; permanence is an illusion; it is an absurd concept without relevance to reality. Only the most fundamental particles are eternal. Everything else, including you and me, are undergoing continual evolution, development, or change.

There is no "you" above, beyond, or safeguarded from the ravages of change; like everything else within reality you are subject to change because you are a purely physical entity and the aspect of yourself that you regard as "you", your personality, is the product of your brain which is endlessly bombarded with inputs, and chemical signals. In an absolute sense, I exist no longer than a moment. However, it is absolutely necessary, for various reasons, that we regard the fetus, the infant, the child, the twenty-year-old, the forty-year-old and the eighty-year-old as "the same person". The colloquial mischaracterization or misconception of the self (like the myth of consent) is needed in order to justify the enforcement of all manner of exploitative arrangements.

Furthermore, our strong memories demand

common threads, links, causal chains – from A to B and from B to C. This is understandable because we exist within a predictable reality (even if we're not capable of developing accurate predictions), the failure lies not in drawing connections between past and present events, but in assuming that agents, actors, persons, personalities, etc., persist over time. No one possesses the brain they did twenty years in the past; their thoughts, feelings and desires are not the same. There are not any unchanging identities imposing their wills upon reality; all humans are simply biological machines dealing with or reacting to the circumstances within which they find themselves. Yes, those circumstances are often the products of events that "they" (the corpse, including the genome) set in motion but the robber and the prisoner, the sower and the harvester, the worker and retiree, etc., are not the same entity in a meaningful sense, in spite of the fact that the latter may retain memories of "their former (or past) selves".

Will is an illusion which assumes that one is in control of their own thoughts. Animals cannot control what impulses, desires, compulsions, etc., that they feel and human thoughts, being products of brains (or more accurately the word thought itself is simply a term for brain activity), are just as much

outside of "our" control as our feelings. Thoughts and feelings are not capable of being controlled, we cannot exert "our will" to influence them. Our thoughts and feelings – like everything within reality – are causally determined by previous events and present circumstances.

Inability to Consent is a Poor Argument Against Procreation

In an absolute sense, no one is capable of consenting to anything. This is because "you" are not a continually existing entity, and because no one possesses the full knowledge necessary to make a truly informed decision. If all decisions were made by unchanging beings possessing full knowledge of the consequences of their decisions, then regret would be an impossibility and consent would be possible to obtain. In reality, consent is an abstraction based upon false notions and so it is a poor basis for any argument, in spite of its persuasive power (which is a consequence of our desire to believe in an "I", a self, which transcends time and circumstance, and which is in control of the decision making process).

As consent is commonly understood and used, knowledge of the events which will transpire during and after the decision is required. Few would say that a person "consented" to losing $50,000 invested with a stock broker who cheated them; instead, we would say that the investor has been deceived, defrauded, robbed, etc., by the stock broker. No one is capable of possessing full knowledge of all of the

consequences of their decisions and so "informed consent" is an illusion. You can develop a notion of what is likely to transpire through calculating probabilities using available information, but for many propositions there is simply not enough information to go on to make a truly informed decision, to calculate probabilities; the proposition is too risky, too uncertain, to be capable of being regarded as something that a person could consent to with any acceptable level of knowledge. If a person were convinced to go along with a risky proposition and it failed to produce the desired/expected outcome(s), we would say that they had been conned or deceived and if it succeeded we would say that they were lucky.

Consent, as a notion, is really just something to reinforce our delusion that we are in control of ourselves. As covered earlier, there is no "I" above and beyond time and matter who is responsible for making decisions. There is only our material brains attempting to navigate the conditions within which they find themselves. As stated earlier, we are undergoing development at all times because our brains are endlessly processing and attempting to apply new information; this is why people find it so difficult to make decisions, stick with them and be satisfied with the outcome(s). The person considering

the scenario at midnight is not the same person considering the scenario at 2 pm and neither of them is the person considering the scenario a week later, so of course we often find it difficult to make decisions. Furthermore, the person making a decision is not the same person who has to live with the consequences five years later.

Consent is not possible to obtain because we cannot ask our future selves what the optimal decision would be. Furthermore, there is no reason to imagine that just because we are happy with our decisions five years from now that we will be happy with those decisions ten years from now, twenty years from now, thirty years from now, etc. The only future self we could really ask and get a final answer from (regarding whether or not any particular decision was the correct one) would be ourselves almost immediately before death. So consent is a watery notion because there is no reason to imagine that we will be satisfied with our own decisions in perpetuity. If everyone were fully satisfied with their decisions in perpetuity, then regret would not exist; there would be no word to describe dissatisfaction with "our own" previous decisions and the dissatisfaction as a neurological sensation would not exist.

Consent is a very weak concept, it is not a strong

basis for any argument for or against anything because it is such an abstract notion, it is so divorced from reality, that it is pointless to use. All that consent describes, the only fact that is relayed by using the term consent, is that a person feels, in the moment in which they affirm something (provide consent), that the projected outcome is something that they would like to transpire. What a vague, watery, and ultimately useless concept consent is.

Some will argue that the concept of consent is of utility because it helps prevent person A from doing things to person B that they would not like to have done to them but this is a poor argument because the concept does not prevent the majority of suffering (which is perpetrated by going against the desires of others) within human societies from being inflicted.

Governments violate the desires of the majority of the populace every day in numerous ways, and the concept of consent has done little to prevent these violations. Of course, the concept of consent doesn't prevent all sexual assault, theft, deception, coercion, etc., which we would all regard as a violation of a person's desires, i.e., a violation of their will, of their consent.

Sure, our placing value in the concept of consent has surely prevented some proportion of suffering by compelling some number of potential perpetrators of suffering from reconsidering but abstractions (such

as consent) do not prevent the vast majority of selfish people from inflicting suffering in order to gratify their own needs or wants.

The concept of consent, I would argue, actually magnifies suffering because it is often used to create justifications for suffering in the following way: if a person decides, with necessarily incomplete knowledge of even the potential outcome of their decision (especially as regards long-term consequences), that they want to carry out x and then later the consequences of x blow up in their face then most people will look at this situation and declare "you reap what you sow" which (though factually true) is actually said to implicate that they deserve the negative consequences, that they deserve to suffer. You carried out x and you have suffered and you "deserve" to suffer because you chose to do it. It is an unacceptable position because no one deserves to suffer. Suffering accomplishes nothing and no being should be compelled to endure any suffering even as a consequence of "their" choices.

To say that suffering is deserved is to say that suffering is good if inflicted upon people who commit x action. If the infliction of suffering is an acceptable punishment for x, then we can debate endlessly about what other actions are deserving of the infliction of suffering and we could simply say that everyone deserves to suffer because we will

never reach a majority consensus as to which actions (and under which circumstances) are deserving of the infliction of suffering and because any consensus is simply the tyranny of a majority opinion, i.e., it is ultimately a widely held subjective stance. No objective metric exists whereby to determine what acts justify inflicting pain upon someone.

Vegans may feel that those who finance the torture of animals who are born, reared, and tortured within factory farms and then tortured and killed within slaughterhouses are deserving of the same treatment. Many people would agree that pedophiles deserve to be tortured and or killed. Some people would say that jaywalkers deserve to be beaten.

Why do we feel that anyone is deserving of punishment? We feel this way because they have inflicted suffering upon ourselves or others, and as a species we are too stupid to overcome the tit-for-tat, eye-for-an-eye mentality and we are too stupid and ignorant to identify that we are all responsible for inflicting suffering. So if the infliction of suffering is deserving of the infliction of suffering as a punishment, then everyone deserves to suffer. To claim that anyone deserves to suffer, on the grounds that inflicting suffering deserves infliction in turn, is to say that all suffering is good because, by that standard, everyone deserves to suffer.

We could continue this endless debate or we could

simply agree that no suffering is acceptable and that "deserve" is a meaningless abstraction cooked up by lunatics to justify suffering.

Consent is an inadequate argument against procreation as life is not bad because we failed to agree to come into it, rather, life is bad because of painful experiences. If pain did not exist, then the experience of sentient life wouldn't be objectionable. If life included no pain whatsoever (and consequently you could choose, at any time, to end your existence without experiencing any pain in the process), you would be regarded as a fool for complaining that your conception was effected without your consultation.

Anti-natalists, like everyone really, need to focus upon real issues, not phantasms and abstractions. Pain is real, pain is why sentience is negative and sentience is why life is negative. Do not waste time bringing nonsense abstractions like consent into a discussion of real issues. It is factually correct that no being is capable of assenting to being conceived and born but that fact, in and of itself, causes no suffering. No one is really upset that they were brought into existence without being consulted; they are upset that they (and/or others) were brought into this nightmare reality replete with pain.

Self Expression

It's funny that people within developed nations, western nations especially, will claim that they value free expression when the majority (who make that claim) are unconcerned when ill consequences fall upon those who are bold enough to say something which goes against the grain, which goes against the commonly held values or perceptions.

What these alleged proponents of free expression intend to convey is that they are opposed to government persecution of people or groups on account of their statements, but these alleged proponents of free expression find it perfectly acceptable that people lose their jobs (or other source(s) of income), and become pariahs because of something that they have said. Alleged proponents of free expression will say "freedom of speech, not freedom from consequences" as though freedom (within this context) should not include freedom from consequences.

Why do I feel that freedom of expression should include protection from losing your job and/or having your business ruined and becoming ostracized? Quite simply, because constructing and expositing an accurate description of anything necessarily demands that we disregard whether or

not people will be upset by said description. Accurate descriptions are needed to better understand reality and consequently identify and eliminate problems. If I cannot even describe the circumstances, if I cannot even identify the problem, without upsetting someone, how can we realistically resolve the issue?

Many people are too stupid and emotionally volatile to listen to anything without being so affected that they lose their composure. There is no combination of words you could say to me to rattle me; and the same should be the case for everyone else. There is no benefit to becoming psychologically distressed by any word or combination of words. Nothing is accomplished by you assaulting or yelling at someone or attempting to sabotage their life because they have said something you dislike. Very infantile and very stupid to allow the opinions of others to control your behavior in this way.

If most people were not extremely stupid, they would maintain their composure when confronted with any argument or even taunt or slander, because words are ultimately nothing and possess only the power which you grant to them. People should be capable of maintaining their composure when confronted by verbally abusive people not because they desire to maintain their composure, or because

they have disciplined themselves to maintain their composure but simply because the verbal abuse possesses absolutely no power over them because they are unconcerned with the stupid statements of stupid people.

If you were not an imbecile and an emotional trainwreck, then you would not be disturbed by any statements. Someone pointing out your "failures" should not upset you, because you should either appreciate the identification of the problem(s), or you should simply be undisturbed by their labeling of whatever as a problem(s) when you are not interested in "correcting" it (or them) in any event.

Unacceptable circumstances are an understandable cause for being upset, words however, are not. I am incensed about starvation, dehydration, predation, industrial accidents, etc., not someone using slurs to refer to me or pointing out perceived defects in my personality, lifestyle or behavior; I am unconcerned with their opinion because I am satisfied with myself.

The emotional volatility and instability of most people is why so many conversations about the important issues cannot take place. It is so difficult to conduct a civil conversation upon even trivial topics in some cases and it is just extremely difficult to conduct a civil conversation upon something

important like any of the topics contained within this book or within On Efilism. Effective communication is an impossibility when conversations are derailed or completely prevented by immature and stupid people, who have no desire to be exposed to any information or perspective upon something which may compel them to adjust their outlook.

As a species, we need to encourage completely honest and open dialogue about every topic. No one should be afraid that their life will be turned upside down by any particular comment that they make or argument that they present; all that is accomplished by punishing people for saying whatever they have said is stifling effective communication by dissuading honesty and transparency.

As a species, we need to encourage people to be mature enough to entertain all ideas and to listen to ideas without becoming aggressive, dismissive or disruptive. No harm is intrinsically inflicted even by the espousal of hateful language; if you encounter someone saying something that upsets you, and which you feel cannot possibly be correct then simply move away from them if you are not inclined to attempt to convince them that they are incorrect. Being violent, dismissive and disruptive does not help resolve or prevent any problems; all it does is create more problems by cutting lines of

communication.

If the tongues of everyone were cut out for causing suffering to others with their speech, then no one capable of speech would be left with a tongue.

Ensuring that people are capable of expressing their viewpoint without suffering ill consequences is not something that the government could guarantee; it is something that would require a fundamental change in the outlook of the majority of our species, it is something that would require a major cultural shift. A society interested in the truth, and in resolving problems has no interest in silencing anyone, even "offensive" or "hateful" people. Mature, level-headed people will not become incensed enough by any utterance to become violent and they will have no incentive to silence or disrupt people with whom they disagree. Those interested in the truth and in resolving problems need to be open to examining all possible explanations and solutions to phenomena and problems.

Mature and level-headed, i.e., rational people have no interest in employing violent means to silence people because they know that persecuting the opposition only creates suffering and it's counter-productive in that it simply convinces people that the persecution is taking place because the persecutors are incapable of refuting the position of the persecuted. Rational people do not allow the

utterances of others to have power over themselves.

Rational people are not dismissive of the views of others, nor will they disrupt a person who is expressing themselves, because in order to determine the accuracy of a position, one must understand it and one must understand something in order to refute it. How can one develop understanding of a position without hearing it? How can one hear an argument when they are not focused or are actively interrupting the person presenting the argument?

We should not be interested in inflicting suffering upon others for holding views with which we disagree. No one objectively "deserves" any suffering; if they did, it would come to them without the need for any person to inflict it upon them. If anyone objectively deserved something, then it would happen to them simply as a consequence of blind, inhuman, physical laws. As with objective morality, objectively deserved punishment would need to be a consequence of physical laws in order for the descriptor "objective" to be applicable. That no punishment is objectively deserved is proven by the fact that nothing intrinsically befalls people for committing certain acts, e.g., not all pedophiles die of kidney failure, not all thieves die of starvation, not all murderers are, in turn, themselves murdered, etc. So we can see that nothing intrinsically, as a consequence of physical laws, befalls anyone for any

particular acts; so no one is objectively deserving of any specific punishment, nor are they deserving of punishment whatsoever. There are no physical laws which guarantee that anything is guaranteed to befall someone for doing x, and there certainly are not any laws which prescribe that something specific will befall someone for doing x. The particles which comprise everything are unconcerned with our notions of justice. That anyone "deserves" anything is a delusion. No one maintains the same set of views throughout the entirety of their lives; so even people that we may imagine are "deserving" of punishment (for their incorrect/hateful viewpoints) will change their perspective upon various topics without intervention.

If we're genuinely interested in eliminating viewpoints with which we disagree, then we need to encourage open and honest dialogue and we need to convince people with whom we disagree, not punish them or silence them with the threat of negative consequences for expressing themselves. If you want to silence someone, show them in what ways they're wrong in a calm, considerate and courteous manner.

If people continue to spread errors in spite of correction, there is little harm to a society comprised of people who are educated upon the relevant topics because they will be informed enough not to accept these errors as true. Education is the solution.

The Mischaracterization of Nihilism

That everything is meaningless and futile (in an absolute and objective sense) is factually correct. However, these facts, even if accepted, do not prevent us from concerning ourselves with any number of different people, places, objects, or concepts. That is to say that things matter, subjectively, even if you are capable of identifying the ultimate meaninglessness and futility of every object and event that will ever exist or transpire throughout the cosmos. That is to say that even if you are capable of acknowledging that every action ever taken by any organism will have accomplished nothing in the grand scheme of things, you are still capable of caring about people, places, objects, and ideas.

Claiming that to be a nihilist is simply to be completely unconcerned with anything is mischaracterizing the position (which I would describe as a fact claim) by equivocating it with the subjective psychological disposition of apathy.

It is certainly true that acknowledging the fact that, in an ultimate sense, everything is futile and meaningless will push a person towards becoming totally unconcerned with everything but it is not a prerequisite to said acknowledgment. You are

capable of being completely unconcerned with everything even if you imagine that meaning or purpose objectively exists for your life, for our species, for life as a phenomenon, for the universe, or cosmos in general, etc. You could be a Christian, Hindu, Zoroastrian, Greek Pagan, etc., and still be completely unconcerned with everything; under those conditions it would, of course, be stupid to be unconcerned because eternal repercussions for any number of actions or failures to take action exist but you are capable of being unconcerned even if you are convinced that the claims of any of these religions or of any spiritual belief systems (of any kind) are factually correct.

Being completely unconcerned with everything is not exclusive to people who recognize the fact that everything will be undone by natural forces at some point in the future. So, as stated earlier, it is a mischaracterization, it is an inaccurate description of nihilism, to say that nihilism is simple apathy and it is a mischaracterization of nihilists to say that they are simply apathetic especially since nihilists, as covered earlier, are fully capable of being concerned with any number of things even though they acknowledge the fact that everything is ultimately meaningless and futile.

Quite frankly, I doubt that any sentient being is capable of being completely unconcerned with

everything (absolutely apathetic) in any event, so the hypothetical and stereotypical nihilist, who feels that nothing matters cannot actually exist because we are biologically compelled to concern ourselves with, if nothing else, the prevention of our own suffering. No sentient being can truly be completely unconcerned with everything, not for any substantial duration of time in any event. Pain will guarantee that you remain concerned with preventing your own suffering. The congenitally insensitive to pain are best equipped to become completely unconcerned with anything or everything that has ever, currently does, or could ever potentially exist or transpire.

When you define nihilism or nihilists as being absolutely apathetic, then you are describing a position and people that do not or can not possibly exist in any event (aside from the congenitally insensitive to pain), i.e., it is a useless definition because it doesn't describe anything that does or could possibly exist (outside of an extreme minority of cases). So if nihilism or a nihilist describes absolute apathy then you may as well cease using the term. When speaking of nihilism or nihilists you need to address the fact claim that nothing ultimately possesses any objective meaning, purpose, function, or value and not the psychological/emotional disposition of apathy.

Labels are not important for any discussion. Labels

are of utility if they ease the conveyance of descriptions of reality; that is to say that labels are of utility when they facilitate understanding. When labels become an obstacle, when they impede understanding, it is best if they are discarded. The position I am describing could just as easily be referred to as eulavist* or some new term I or someone else could invent. Essentially all that nihilists are saying is that reality is not defined or impacted by the abstract concepts which we attempt to impose upon reality. As a species, we could forego all discussion or thinking in terms of inapplicable** abstractions like freedom, value, purpose, meaning, etc., and the veils of innumerable illusions would be lifted and we would be left discussing or thinking about reality as it actually is, i.e., unvarnished, unembellished, plain, clear, transparent, etc.

I feel that the term nihilist, in spite of its colloquial pejorative connotation (which is that nihilism can simply be equated with absolute apathy), is still useful as a single word to convey the position that we exist within an objectively meaningless, purposeless, amoral, and valueless reality. When I use the terms nihilism and nihilist, I am describing the position and the adherents of the position I have just stated.

I would not use the term nihilism to describe an outlook upon existence of absolute apathy and I

would not use the term nihilist to describe the absolutely apathetic, because that position can exist only on paper (for the vast majority anyway), i.e., the percentage of sentient beings capable of being completely apathetic is so tiny it is not worthy of frequent reference or thorough discussion. As stated within On Efilism, nihilism is a term to label the position, to label a stance upon the fact claim, that we exist within an objectively meaningless, purposeless, amoral, and valueless reality. Nihilism, like atheism, is the null hypothesis, the neutral position in that it assumes nothing. Our reality cannot be said to contain or be governed (determined) by any meaning(s), purpose(s), moral(s) or value(s) until proven otherwise; just as our reality cannot be said to be the product of a creator or of creators until proven otherwise.

The onus, the burden of proof, is upon those who claim that objective meaning, purpose, morality, value, etc., exist because they are the ones who are making a positive fact claim. Claims submitted without evidence can be dismissed without evidence. It is nothing to dismiss unsubstantiated claims. Nihilism, like atheism, is the default position of people until they are programmed to accept that these abstractions are anything other than social constructs.

Notes:

* Eulavism is the label for the philosophical stance that all values are fictitious and that this reality is meaningless, and purposeless. The label was created by Adam Lanza and he was also the chief proponent of the position under that label. Of course, his stance could also have accurately been labeled as nihilism.

** These abstractions are not applicable to reality because there are no fixed and universally accepted definitions, and also because they are ultimately inconsequential in any event. There are no fixed and universally accepted definitions for freedom, liberty, tyranny, justice, consent, courtesy, humane, etc. Furthermore, abstract concepts are not very important because they are seldom as impactful as we imagine them to be. It is true that abstractions have been responsible for the infliction of insane amounts of suffering and have led to the deaths of who knows how many humans and non-human animals, but the abstractions are not the sole (and are seldom the primary) factor.

There are not many important events which are the product of a single cause. So, although religious conviction may have been the primary motive for most participants in most wars throughout human history, it cannot be said that those wars were the

sole product of religious dispute when many of the participants and especially the orchestrators of wars were motivated by their desire to acquire material riches.

What proportion of people go through life attempting to maintain strict adherence to any set of principles? Principles, values, ideals, etc., are easily forgotten in the moment, whilst you are doing something, especially under duress. Everything is so easily tossed aside, especially when the stakes are high; how easily we forget the sacredness of matrimony when presented with an opportunity to engage in sexual conduct with someone we feel is irresistible, how easily we toss aside notions about the inestimable value of life for a certain monetary price, how easily we steal when we're in pain over our inability to satisfy some want or need. We are adapted to survive within precarious circumstances, we did not evolve in order to strictly adhere to any set of prescriptions and or proscriptions.

All abstractions, though somewhat impactful, are tossed aside once they become a fetter; people violate their morals, principles, values, ideals, etc., whenever they feel that there is a need to do so or even when they are simply behaving without placing much thought into how they are behaving, into what the potential consequences will be. Furthermore, as stated within On Efilism, the majority of people

violate their stated preferences, morals, ideals, etc., quite often without any knowledge of the violation.

It's so funny that I wrote all of these things and months after writing them was willing to ignore everything that I knew about the nature of relationships and suffering in order to be with a woman simply because the desire to do so was so strong.

Concepts such as consent, rights, liberty, etc., may prevent some suffering but, as covered earlier, they ultimately create more suffering than they prevent. Abstract concepts do not prevent the majority from allowing base impulses and desires to control their behavior; only real, negative, consequences prevent people from engaging in anti-social behavior which benefits themselves.

In a world in which no consequences are imposed upon people by society for behaving in any particular way, you may argue about the utility of inculcating abstractions into the populace in order to prevent anti-social behavior. In a society which fails to punish rape, theft, kidnapping, etc., you could argue that because no societally imposed consequences are befalling the perpetrators that propaganda is needed in order to prevent people from carrying out these acts.

When there exists no realistic prospect of suffering for behaving or failing to behave in a proscribed or

prescribed manner, then only the personal sentiments of the individual will be capable of guiding them. In this scenario, it is important to control the thoughts and feelings of people so that they are naturally not inclined to cause themselves and/or others to suffer. Obviously, societies are structured so that penalties are imposed upon those who behave or fail to behave as proscribed or prescribed. Punishing those who go against the cultural norms is essential for the maintenance of every functional society.

Every society must, at bare minimum, promote the beliefs that reproduction is acceptable or good, that instrumentalizing suffering is acceptable or good and that life is acceptable or good, that pleasure makes life worthy of propagating and continuing, that life has purpose, meaning, value, etc., and that abstract concepts are important enough to suffer and create suffering in order to "uphold".

Of course no abstraction is capable of being upheld as all those who value it imagine it should be upheld because no agreement exists (upon the abstraction itself or how it ought to be upheld, enacted, enforced, etc.) between all those who value the abstraction. There is no society which has upheld any abstraction, let's use justice as an example, to the satisfaction of everyone who feels that the concept is of utility or good or sacred. There has never been a

society which has been perfectly just, which has upheld and embodied the abstraction of justice, to the complete satisfaction of everyone who has ever and will ever value the notion of justice.

Our current conception of justice would not satisfy the majority of people who lived two thousand years prior to ourselves and it will not satisfy future generations either; that this is so is proven by the fact that even now there exists no universally shared conception of what is just or unjust, of what constitutes a just or unjust reward or punishment for anything.

The only nearly universally experienced and thus shared values are pleasure and pain. The biological facts of pleasure and pain are our sole point of agreement as a species and as sentient beings.

Conclusion:

As a species, we would be better equipped to identify and resolve problems if we realized that we exist within an objectively meaningless, purposeless, valueless, and amoral reality. The delusion that our individual lives, our species, life in general, our planet, our universe, etc., possesses meaning or purpose must be done away. Only when we realize that everything that we, as individuals, or as a species, are doing is futile will we see what is of real

import. In an ultimate sense, only pleasure and pain matter. Almost everything that every sentient organism upon the Earth does is to either move away from sources of pain or attempt to induce pleasure. Pleasure is what we're living to receive, and pain is the looming threat which becomes a reality and is inflicted again and again for failure to live correctly, to live as we were programmed to.

Biological Warfare

Someone I know said I should state the following explicitly, apparently the intimations within On Efilism are too subtle, so here goes; nearly every activity in which we are engaged, whether we are aware of it or not, is undertaken in an attempt to ensure that our genes survive either by securing our existence, or the existence of our offspring.

In the conclusion to the last essay, I reduced nearly all activity to attempting to secure pleasure and avoid pain, and these two statements are complementary, not contradictory. This is because we have been programmed (through mutation and natural selection, i.e., evolution) to receive pleasure from things which enable us to exist longer and procreate and we have been programmed to experience pain when our existence or prospects of procreating are endangered.

Chemical (genetic) preservation is the primary goal determining how we behave; pleasure and pain exist as they do in order to facilitate the preservation (through prolonging life and through replication) of chemical combinations, i.e., genes. The activities and objects from which we receive pleasure and pain induce those neurological states as they do because they either improve or worsen our odds of

preserving our genetics. We receive pleasure from consuming food, having sex, building friendships, improving our appearance, etc., because these things help us preserve our genetics by ensuring our survival and/or improve our odds of replicating our genes through procreation. We receive pain from sharp objects, the disintegration of relationships, loss of employment, becoming "ugly", losing access to clean food and water, etc., because these things endanger the preservation of our genes by either threatening our existence, or by worsening our odds of procreating.

Pleasure and pain, reward and punishment, are motivations to ensure the preservation of our genetics, to ensure chemical preservation. Chemical preservation is the most fundamental factor determining how all organisms behave. Chemical preservation cannot even be regarded as a conscious goal because even brainless viruses, fungi, plants, and bacteria still undertake the tasks of preserving and replicating themselves. Chemical preservation is an unconscious drive and it is the basis for organic behavior. Pleasure and pain, reward and punishment, are a layer atop this fundamental basis which serve to ensure that chemical preservation is achieved.

Life is biological warfare; life is chemical warfare. Whether we are aware of it or not, nearly every activity in which every organism upon the Earth is

engaged is to preserve themselves and replicate their chemical compounds. For sentient beings, life is an endless struggle to avoid pain and induce pleasure, and of course, this endless struggle is simply an effective means to ensure that those chemical compounds are preserved and replicated. We have been naturally selected to carry out tasks which will ensure that our genes are preserved and replicated.

We are predisposed to assign positive value to life, we are predisposed to assign positive value to continuing life, because we are the products of hundreds of millions of years of selective pressure favoring organisms who are interested in continuing the struggle for existence; apathy is maladaptive. Whether they are aware of it or not, people who claim or feel that life is good probably feel this way only because of unconscious neuro-chemical drives, which are themselves the product of naturally selected physiological characteristics.

You are interested in continuing life and in procreating as a consequence of naturally selected neuro-chemical drives (instincts), not because you have rationally concluded that your life is good or that life as a phenomenon is good.

For most humans, their concepts, beliefs, and belief systems about every facet of existence serve to reinforce the notion that their lives and the

phenomenon of life are good, or at least acceptable. This could be demonstrated in many ways; however, a simple example suffices. We unquestioningly assign positive value to productivity and efficiency, though productivity and efficiency could only be assigned positive value by people who already maintain the view that life is good or acceptable. For myself, I assign productivity and efficiency positive value only insofar as they are of utility in preventing and eliminating suffering; productivity and efficiency are devoid of positive value in and of themselves because life is not worthy of being continued and so there is no concern, on my part, for long-term productive capability.

The nonsensical concept of legacy requires that life be positively valued. Obviously, no legacy can remain if there are not any intelligent beings alive to remember anything. This is especially true for a "genetic legacy", often phrased as "keeping the bloodline alive" or "carrying on the family line". Obviously, you would only be concerned with passing on your genes if you assigned positive value to existence.

I could go on and on but for the sake of brevity and out of laziness, I am just going to cut to the chase and state the obvious. So many things which we feel are of import, depend upon the

presupposition, upon the unquestioned presumption, that life is good or at the very least acceptable or tolerable.

Why take my hat off within a restaurant? I should do so because it is the cultural norm and to go against the cultural norm could produce negative consequences which I would like to avoid. All of this assumes that I am interested in continuing existence; if I am unconcerned with continuing existence, then no consequences concern me because I will simply end my life when the burden becomes too great to bear.

Why concern myself with my health? I should do so because if I do not do my best to maintain good health, my quality of life may well worsen dramatically. In fact, it may well worsen dramatically in spite of my best efforts. Obviously, the suffering I may experience for failure to take care of myself to the best of my ability is of no import if I'm uninterested in living because I can simply end my existence if existence becomes unbearable.

Your presupposition that life is fine, acceptable, or tolerable, etc., is because you have been naturally selected and culturally inculcated, i.e., biologically and socially engineered and programmed, to accept that notion. If you would question the notion and begin to think of things as they are (as consequences

of purely natural forces), if you would ask "why is x belief held?" (whilst keeping in mind that psychological dispositions are naturally selected for and against) you would become keenly aware that most sentient organisms are predisposed to hold and formulate beliefs which (directly or indirectly) reinforce the notion that existence is good, acceptable, or tolerable, etc.

From there, you would become capable of identifying in what ways different notions, concepts, beliefs, belief systems, etc., provide a selective advantage, i.e., you would become capable of identifying in what ways different abstractions motivate people to continue existing and procreating. That is to say that with the knowledge I have presented to you, you would become capable of seeing how different abstractions were formulated and promulgated because they empowered those who hold them to better preserve their chemical compounds.

To put it very simply: memes empower organisms to better preserve and promulgate their genes through providing motivation to continue existing and breeding. Life is biological warfare between competing chemical compounds, between competing bacteria, viruses, and fungi. Animals are interesting in that we are actually a macroscopic symbiotic bacterial-viral-fungal super-colony; though the

bacteria are primarily (but not solely) responsible for the development of our bodies.

Life is nothing more than a blind, meaningless, and pointless competition between differing combinations of chemicals. A competition in which the prize for winning is the preservation of some chemical compounds. A competition in which, an incalculable number of losers are ground up and consumed by the winners each day. A competition, a biological arms race, which (upon the Earth in any event) necessitated the development of sentience, the ability to experience pleasure and pain because ambulatory cannibalistic eukaryotes were able to evolve.

So this biological arms race, this life, is why so much misery exists. Some say that life is made for suffering, but it is actually the inverse. Suffering is tailor-made for life. Obviously, rewards and punishments must motivate the organism to achieve the intended outcome. Of course, reproduction was not a goal, an intended outcome, for the earliest replicating microbes, it is simply that those best equipped to survive and replicate proliferated more greatly than those poorly adapted to survive and replicate themselves. It is more accurate to state that rewards and punishments will enable an organism to survive and reproduce with greater success if the

rewards and punishments are providing accurate data about what will harm or benefit the organism. There is a selective pressure in favor of accurate rewards and punishments; arbitrary rewards and punishments will not help an organism survive and may actually imperil the organism, so obviously, organisms who are being motivated properly, i.e., who are being provided with accurate data about what harms or benefits their survival and reproduction, are going to become the majority of the population. Our sensory apparati are finely honed, finely tuned, to enable us to survive upon the Earth. Suffering is made for life.

Socially conceived and dispersed beliefs, i.e., memes, cultural propaganda, values, or whatever other term you want to use survive and spread because they provide a survival advantage to those who accept those memes as true. Of course, the meme may well have been conceived in order to provide an explanation for something inexplicable, or to provide certain individuals, classes, or races of people with an advantage or justification for maintaining their supremacy. A meme, a socially created and dispersed belief or set of beliefs, may have been created with good or bad intentions. It may have been based upon true or false information, etc., but ultimately, all memes survive (in the long

run), because they provide a real survival advantage to the population which adopts said meme(s).

To illustrate this point, let us look at a real-world example. The meme, the myth, that hierarchies were established by the gods and that the working classes have a sacred obligation to obey their masters enabled all who adhered to that meme to better survive and reproduce within societies of the past. The members of the working classes who rejected the myth were killed and the members of the ruling classes who rejected the myth were stripped of power and/or killed. This particular meme is an obvious artifice of the ruling classes themselves. It is a meme the acceptance of which is of benefit to all concerned in that the upholders of the lie would inflict great suffering or even death upon those who would attempt to fight it. Memes are crafted and upheld by the powerful for their own benefit and the weak benefit from accepting the memes in that they will avoid ill consequences.

One could argue that this is a poor example of the utility of memes because this particular cultural mythology is of utility exclusively within the context of hierarchical, i.e., class-based societies which use belief in the supernatural to justify the inequalities which exist within them. This objection is a rather poor one because all memes, all cultural mythologies, are necessarily created and spread within societies,

and the memes which enable a human to better survive and reproduce within a particular society will obviously depend upon the circumstances of said society. There are (proportionately, anyway) few memes, few culturally formed and promoted beliefs, which would be of utility to a man existing as an individual within the wild. Some examples of beliefs which are of utility to an individual within the wild include: the belief that life is sacred, that suicide condemns one to eternal torment or reincarnation within this world, that certain animals or animal products are spiritually unclean, etc. These examples, based upon false premises, do improve odds of survival if they are genuinely accepted as true. These memes are objectively of utility in preserving your genetics and so it is that we see these beliefs develop and propagate across the world; all societies say that life is sacred, that to end one's life may produce negative consequences in the afterlife or next incarnation, and that certain animals or animal products (those which that society was not capable of processing and preparing in a sanitary manner) were spiritually unclean. Memes, like genes, are subject to a selection process. Those memes which make the organism most fit for its circumstances are most likely to proliferate.

There are plenty of beliefs which offer absolutely no objective survival advantage whatsoever; which

must be adhered to so as not to jeopardize prospects of survival and breeding. Consuming beef within India or pork within muslim nations will harm your prospects of survival (or reproducing at the very least) even though both cow and pig can be raised, slaughtered and processed within sanitary conditions; the meat can be safely consumed, but you will still suffer social consequences because of the cultural programming. So there are many obsolete, pointless, and even defective* (meaning that they actually harm your odds of surviving and procreating) memes but overall most memes are responsible for contributing to your survival within whatever circumstances in which you live. That this is evidently so is shown by the fact that the majority of humans who exist within technologically advanced societies survive long enough to procreate; that is to say that humans who exist within societies in which they will not die due to disease or predation are likely to survive long enough to procreate which would not be possible (even under those circumstances) if most or all of their culturally inculcated beliefs were pro-death and/or anti-natalist.

Note:

* An example of a defective meme is that to show true dedication to Yahweh you must forego sex.

Obviously, this myth, this meme, prevents those who adhere to it from procreating.

Conclusion:

Organisms are engaged in an ultimately pointless, futile, and meaningless conflict with one another so as to preserve their chemical composition. We are engaged in endless cannibalizing of other Earth lifeforms so that we can propagate our genetics. Of course, the absurdity of organisms being chemically compelled to preserve some chemical compounds would not be important if importance did not evolve; the endless struggle, the endless competition, war, conflict, between organisms would not matter if organisms capable of feeling pleasure and pain did not evolve.

Relevance, concern, mattering, caring, importance, etc., exist only because organisms capable of experiencing pleasure and pain exist; relevance, concern, mattering, caring, importance, etc., exist only for beings capable of experiencing pleasure and pain. A rock, lacking a brain, is obviously incapable of caring about anything. Simple bacteria, lacking brains, are incapable of caring about anything.

To reiterate, we have all been naturally selected to positively value, consciously or unconsciously,

concepts, notions, systems of thought, schools of thought, perspectives, etc., which empower us to continue living and procreating. It is an optimistic bias, a bias in favor of living and breeding.

Self Deception

All morals, purposes, meanings, etc., are simply self deception and self delusion. We construct and accept abstract nonsense. We deceive ourselves in order to make life more bearable. When our species began to construct abstract nonsense to delude itself is hard to know, but I can hazard a guess.

It is safe to assume that the mass concoction and proliferation of baseless abstractions began even before our species evolved; probably previous hominid species, who had technologically advanced sufficiently enough to provide them with leisure time were the earliest purveyors of abstract falsehoods. Our forebears who had no leisure time whatsoever, who were completely preoccupied with securing their existence, certainly were not capable of inventing notions like god, spirit, afterworld, justice, fairness, etc. Certainly they were neurologically equipped to do so, but lacking the time to give any consideration to anything aside from their survival they were not empowered to devise these falsehoods.

In fact, for people without any free time, there was not only no opportunity to devise abstractions, but there also existed no need to do so. Abstractions were developed in order to resolve or answer problems or questions which did not or could not

exist for people totally devoid of any substantial quantity of free time; this is because these problems and questions cannot be devised or identified, unless one has the time to devise or identify them. That is to say that the problems or questions for which our logical, mathematical, philosophical, moral, ethical, etc., conjectures, solutions or answers are intended are themselves abstract fictions. The abstract questions, problems, answers and solutions are all non-existent for extremely primitive animals.

Whether life or the entirety of existence is possessed of meaning, purpose, or function is a question we ask only because we are empowered to ponder it, nay we are compelled to ponder it or some other abstract nonsense because we are so empowered; that is to say that because we have been granted so much free time, (due to the development of time and labor saving technics) we are compelled to invent problems or questions to resolve or answer in order to keep ourselves stimulated.

We have evolved to identify and resolve problems in order to maximize our odds of surviving and procreating. We did not evolve to simply relax and psychologically shut down, to think of absolutely nothing, after our serious problems have been resolved. So of course, people are going to invent or identify problems that do not actually exist (that do not actually impact their odds of surviving or

procreating), we are compelled to identify and resolve problems. The majority of us are not capable of sitting quietly without any thoughts going through our brains.

As a brief aside, it is perhaps worth reiterating that the fictitious garbage abstractions that we invent provide a survival or reproductive advantage in that they can motivate people to continue existing or help someone get along easier with the group to which they belong, but these advantages exist only because of the fact that we, as a species, have removed ourselves, to varying degrees (on the basis of the individual, class and nationality)*, from the struggle for existence which, for our ancestors, was constant. It is only because of the fact that we are not endlessly preoccupied with securing food, water, and shelter that we concern ourselves with abstract notions and that we are all compelled to at least feign belief in whatever, in order to blend into the society within which we exist; it is only because we have developed language that we're capable of telling ourselves a pack of lies to "improve" our psychological state in order to continue this pointless struggle, this meaningless existence, this life. On the other hand, we must, of course, account for the fact that our ability to contemplate existence is responsible for creating the distress with which to

begin, that is to say that the lies that we tell ourselves in order to make existence bearable are needed only because we are capable of identifying that existence is pointless, meaningless, futile, purposeless, etc.

We are only obliged to pay lip service to baseless nonsense, such as the cultural norms, because our species has invented baseless nonsense, and because said nonsense is widely accepted. The ruling classes have always invented abstract garbage beliefs, concepts, or notions which will help establish or maintain whatever state of affairs they wish to exist. The ruling classes have been the chief culprits behind the dissemination of abstract falsehoods throughout the history of our species. The efforts of the ruling classes to inculcate certain values into their subjects, are why falsehoods are and have always been so widely dispersed and accepted. More often than not, the beliefs which are popular are those which benefit the ruling classes or which, at the least, benefit whoever intends to replace them or infiltrate their ranks; words are weapons.

So the survival advantages which baseless abstractions offer (such as providing motivation and enabling one to blend in with their group) exist only because we as a species put stock in falsehoods with which to begin. If everyone knew that life was pointless, meaningless, purposeless, etc., then the

pro-life propaganda would not offer any survival advantage. If no one believed in god, then belief in god would not help a person succeed (succeed biologically, i.e., as a reproducing machine) within that society. If people saw the concept of rights for the illusion that it is then professional "philosophers" would not be capable of sustaining themselves by rambling about the concept and writing about it, etc.

As a species, as we have gradually removed obstacles to our survival (on the individual, class, and national levels), we have invented new problems or questions to solve or answer by developing science, mathematics, philosophy, the arts, etc. We are obliged to continue exploring these new frontiers to keep ourselves stimulated enough to overlook the obvious fact that all of these efforts, these expenditures of energy and suffering, are objectively and ultimately futile, pointless, meaningless, purposeless, etc., because life and existence (the cosmos itself), are futile, pointless, meaningless, purposeless, etc.

We convince ourselves that these endeavors are of import in spite of the fact that all of our efforts will ultimately come to naught. As stated within On Efilism, inevitably all traces of our existence will disappear and the entirety of the cosmos will be devoid of life, let alone sentience or sapience.

Our species is akin to a hamster who, after being compelled to endlessly run upon a wheel, has been freed and which is distracting itself in order to be capable of overlooking the fact that running upon the wheel and distracting itself were both ultimately pointless, purposeless, meaningless, and futile. Our species has developed societies, cultures, civilizations, philosophies, etc., founded upon lies for the absurd goals of staving off boredom and not being forced to confront the fact that reality is purposeless, pointless, meaningless, and futile. Most people are unaware that these are their primary motivations for engaging in the creation, acceptance, and promulgation of these abstract absurdities. People are unaware that they are vehicles for memes solely because the memes make existence bearable; that is to say that they are unaware that they carry these beliefs solely because said beliefs motivate them to continue existing.

The majority are so self-deluded that they are incapable of identifying the memes for what they are; they genuinely believe that the claims or that the perception or conception of reality presented by the memes is authentic, i.e., factually correct. The majority fail to see that all that the memes ever were were tools to aid in our survival (directly or indirectly).

Some memes, some abstractions, are more

grounded in (and consequently useful for understanding) reality than others. The notions of God, meaning, and purpose tell us nothing about how our reality functions, mathematics on the other hand does. Mathematics can provide us with accurate information about innumerable events and objects, it is a directly useful abstraction, it provides us with information which directly improves our odds of surviving and procreating, and of course, it can provide us with information about all manner of trivial nonsense as well.

Mathematics (being so devoid of nonsense and thus of such great utility in helping us understand how reality functions and in completing any number of tasks) is often mistakenly viewed as "the language of the universe", i.e., people often feel that mathematics is "discovered", that reality is actually dictated or determined by the abstraction which humanity developed. Reality is not dictated or determined by any abstraction of human invention irrespective of how accurate said abstraction is. Hypothetically, we may develop a model of reality devoid of any inaccuracy, we may be capable of predicting or calculating any or every event that has ever or will ever transpire. That model, that abstraction, would not be what dictates or determines how reality functions, nor would that flawless model be synonymous with reality itself in the same way that

a perfectly clear photograph is not literally the object photographed in spite of its fidelity to reality.

Our reality isn't determined or impacted by our notions of space, time, distance or temperature or how we choose to measure these abstractions. The cosmos, our entire reality, are just a bunch of particles acting and reacting to one another; they are not influenced by whether we measure their temperature in celsius or kelvin, whether we measure the distance from star A to star B in feet, meters, miles, kilometers, light years, train car lengths, etc. Mathematics, time, temperature, distance, etc., are not fundamental aspects of reality, they are abstractions, i.e., tools to help us understand how reality is and how it functions.

Of course, we could hypothetically develop a completely accurate understanding or way of understanding X, but our understanding or way of understanding X is not synonymous with X itself. A series of high fidelity photographs, or illustrations of a truck could be utilized by a mechanic to diagnose various problems but the depictions of the truck obviously are not the truck and the depictions do not dictate or determine the reality. Our reality is not mathematical. Mathematics is simply a delusion-free and thus, a useful/competent/accurate abstraction (tool) to understand the cosmos.

To return to the main point, some memes, some abstractions, could hardly be labeled as "delusions"; that is to say that they are providing accurate information about reality or an accurate conception or perception of information. Mathematics cannot fairly be regarded as a delusion, people may develop the delusional belief that reality is mathematical, but mathematics itself is not a delusion, it is a tool which is providing us with provably accurate data. Many abstractions, notions, concepts, perceptions, etc., are not delusions or delusional (they are not inaccurate descriptions/perceptions/conceptions of reality) but of course they are not themselves reality; they are of utility so long as we remain cognizant of the fact that we are not the masters or arbiters of the cosmos, of reality, and that these abstractions are simply tools for understanding and conceptualizing or perceiving reality. So long as we remember not to mistake the depiction for the thing depicted we are perfectly fine making use of abstractions.

It is pretty simple to determine which concepts, views, notions, abstractions, tools, etc., are useful, accurate, factually correct, objective, etc. We can use the simple metric of "is it telling us anything provably true?", e.g., Is the smoke detector telling us anything provably true? To beat a dead horse: is the notion that "the universe is mathematical" telling us anything provably true? No, it is not because

mathematics is a human social construct and there is no indication that the smallest particles, that the building blocks of existence, or any combination of said particles, are in any way concerned with, impacted, influenced, determined, or dictated by "mathematics" however you would like to define mathematics. Whether you feel that mathematics is real**, or an abstraction there is nothing to indicate that mathematics determines particle interactions and not the inverse, i.e., that mathematics is only useful because particle interactions are predictable*** and that this predictability enables us to establish laws and rules for performing calculations. The notion is provably untrue, therefore it is delusional. The notions of God, meaning, purpose, morality, etc., don't tell us anything about reality which are provably true and so they are shown to be delusions, fictions of our own imagining without any basis in fact.

Why is mathematics so devoid of delusion? Because people see mathematics for what it is – a tool – and consequently, absurdities which would harm its efficacy or efficiency in solving problems are not introduced into the field. The same is true of language, people are aware that language is simply a tool and so absurdities are not introduced into our conception of what language is and the majority of

people are not interested in introducing absurdities into existing languages. Mathematics and language were intentionally developed and refined because they provided a direct benefit; they provided a real survival advantage to the societies which made use of them.

So whence came delusional abstractions? Why do people invent, accept, and disperse notions which provide no real advantage and the truth of which they are incapable of verifying or are only capable of verifying in the negative? Why do we believe unfalsifiable claims and provably false claims?

I would say that we are inclined to invent, accept, and disperse baseless absurdities because, for most of us anyway, feeling as though we know or understand something is more important and gratifying than developing an authentic understanding of the topic which very well may mean that you are forced to accept that you are not capable of knowing or understanding something.

Gratification supersedes truth, happiness trumps factuality; belief in an afterworld is a good example of this. Instead of accepting that people about whom we cared lead terrible lives full of suffering and that they now no longer exist we like to tell ourselves that they are "in a better place now"; the lies give us solace. Satisfying our psychological needs is of greater import than knowing the truth.

The miasma theory of disease is another good example of our species developing, accepting, and spreading delusions because they satisfy our desire for knowledge. It is harmful to our pride and the issue will nag us if we simply admit that this question or problem cannot be answered or resolved at this time. Miasma theory was an earnest attempt to provide an explanation for how diseases are borne and spread, but like most humans throughout history, those who developed and spread the idea did so upon a weak evidential basis. It is the same with the humoral theory of disease, people just spreading falsehoods because they are easily convinced and/or valued the feeling that they possess knowledge of something over developing an authentic understanding and acknowledging their ignorance.

Most delusions were (especially in the past) created, accepted, and promoted by people earnestly seeking the truth, but who were too prideful or too easily convinced (their standards for what constitutes proof were too low) to avoid inventing, accepting, and/or promoting falsehoods.

The simplicity of human industry in the past also enabled us to get by with delusional beliefs because some incorrect conceptions or understandings of natural forces were accurate enough to be of utility in completing the less precise and sophisticated tasks which were undertaken in the past. Delusions were

not as disruptive as they would be today because the tasks did not necessitate so fine and thorough an understanding of the subject in order to provide performative efficacy.

So the main causes for the large-scale invention and adoption of falsehoods are ignorance, pride, desire to feel gratification for possessing knowledge, and inaccurate conceptions or data which provide some degree of performative efficacy and, of course, one of the most important causes is indoctrination. People are indoctrinated into accepting falsehoods because caregivers, friends, the government, etc., want people to be a certain way, and people willingly accept falsehoods because they would like to blend in. People who accept the falsehoods are more likely to survive and procreate and so the falsehoods are endlessly replicated because they provide a survival or reproductive advantage within the context of x culture. The falsehoods could even be blatantly untrue, as in the case of religion, and still circulate simply because they have become established.

Religion is a particularly interesting example of self-deception because its conception, development, and dissemination are the product of all of the psychological defects needed for people to delude themselves. Religion began, in most cases (this was especially true for the very earliest examples of

human supernatural belief), as an earnest attempt to discern and describe facts about reality. Ignorant people came up with these baseless supernatural "explanations" and they became widely accepted because we value answers, explanations, "understanding" and "knowledge" over genuine understanding and knowledge; that is to say that an inaccurate answer is valued more highly, by most humans, than is an acknowledgment of ignorance. Religion then became a tool of the ruling classes to control the subject classes, and now religion persists solely as an artifact of previous times, a meme replicating solely because it has always been popular, solely because it became established, an institution. Powerful people and groups still make use of religion, they will still pay it lip service, but it is not very important within developed nations. Mainstream religion has simply devolved into financial parasitism in which the charismatic extract money from the gullible.

Religion persists because of indoctrination. If no one were told that there was a supernatural aspect to reality, or that our reality was created by an intelligence (and assuming that all media which put forth these positions were destroyed), then it is incredibly unlikely that anyone who understands the facts relevant to these claims (which undermine them) which scientists have uncovered within the

past few centuries (information regarding emergent complexity, abiogenesis, the formation of the universe, etc.) would independently come to the conclusion that there is an immaterial aspect to reality and that our reality was created by an intelligence. Religion persists because the indoctrination never ended, religion has become the perfect example of a useless meme. Religious beliefs are transmitted because caregivers or organizations (for whatever reason or reasons) wish for whoever to accept x as true, because people wish to find community or because they are ignorant, stupid, gullible, etc. and the absurd claims are genuinely convincing. If caregivers and organizations (such as governments and religious charities) did not indoctrinate people, if lonely people did not seek community within cults, and if stupidity, gullibility and ignorance were all eliminated, then religion (and all supernatural beliefs) would disappear.

Epistemological nihilists maintain that all "knowledge" is delusional and that nothing can be known about anything; amusingly enough, this itself is a knowledge claim which could be regarded as a delusion. How can an epistemological nihilist state, with certainty, that knowledge is impossible to attain? One could argue that all knowledge is certainly delusional because knowledge is a

neurological phenomenon and human brains are faulty. I have already gone into the topic of epistemological nihilism within On Efilism, so just see the first section of that book for a more thorough response to the epistemological nihilist position. Suffice it to say that epistemological nihilism is self-refuting and so it is an absurdity.

Furthermore, as explained within On Efilism, there is no justification for concluding that our brains are incapable of discerning reality as it actually is, there is no justification for concluding that our perceptions and conceptions are completely arbitrary, fictitious, delusional, etc. Certainly it is true that all knowledge exists within, and is created by brains but it is not accurate to state that knowledge is a delusion, i.e., to state that the notions or perceptions within our brains fail to comport with the genuine arrangement or interactions of particles in reality. Notions within brains can be true, i.e., they can accurately comport with reality. Labeling accurate perceptions or conceptions of reality as delusions is idiotic. Unfalsifiable, unverifiable claims, such as epistemological nihilism, are not worthy of consideration because they are not capable of being proven or disproven in an absolute sense.

Notes:

* That is to say that as an individual removes obstacles to their own survival that they will be compelled to invent or identify problems or questions to resolve or answer and that this is the case on the class and national levels as well. Technical progress has not been consistent across cultures and the quantity of leisure time (which is required to invent or identify problems or questions) is not the same for people of different classes or even for different individuals of the same class. Obviously, a factory worker with no children or significant other will have more free time than a coworker with three children and a wife. Obviously, the factory owner will have more free time than any of his employees, unless, of course, he takes a direct role in managing the enterprise.

So there are different levels of acculturation, of indoctrination, across different cultures, classes and amongst different individuals.

** In the same way that temperature, time and distance are not real, mathematics is also not real. They are tools to aid us in understanding things and in completing tasks.

*** Of course, mathematics was not conceived by observing reality at the particle level, but it is the predictability, the regularity, of particles and particle

interactions which enables anything complex to naturally emerge. If particles were chaotic and unpredictable, i.e., irregular, then we would not see the emergence of complex systems like stars, life, etc.

Eulavism

Eulavist is the term that Adam Lanza coined to describe his anti-value stance. Lanza used value with the same connotation as Inmendham, i.e., to describe positive and negative neurological sensation, positive and negative experience. Lanza, unlike Inmendham and efilists, felt that it was best if there existed no capacity to experience anything within the universe, that is to say that he opposed sentience so strongly that the notion of a life of pure bliss was repugnant to him.

Critics of eulavism will state that opposing value whilst experiencing value is contradictory and Lanza himself felt that it was contradictory, but no it really is not. Eulavism is not contradictory in the same way and for the same reason that efilism is not contradictory or "self-defeating". To be anti-value or anti-life whilst being sentient or alive is not contradictory or self-defeating or absurd because to oppose sentience (value) or life in general, one must experience these things. I am not capable of opposing something of which I am unaware. The positions of Lanza and Inmendham are not internally contradictory or absurd or self-defeating, etc. because knowledge is needed to understand the issue and one can only possess knowledge of pleasure and

pain through experiencing them.

It is funny that one should say "anti-life" in reference to Inmendham's philosophical stance because he himself has stated that the term life should only be applied to sentient beings and to experience what Lanza defines as value (which is, in fact, simply an adoption of the definition which Inmendham uses) one must be sentient. The divergence between Lanza and Inmendham is not as great or wide as people imagine.

Both Inmendham and Lanza are really only opposed to the existence of sentience. Inmendham because of the existence of negative value, i.e., pain, suffering, harm, dissatisfaction, need, displeasure, etc. and Lanza is ostensibly opposed to the phenomenon of sentience in toto. Lanza stated that he would oppose value (which is obviously generated exclusively by sentient beings and which is really equivalent with sentience, i.e., sentience is defined by experience, both pleasurable and painful) even in the absence of suffering, i.e. even if all value, all experience, was pleasurable, or at least, neutral.

I doubt that Lanza or anyone else who is allegedly so vehemently opposed to the phenomenon of sentience, to experiencing value, would genuinely oppose sentience were no suffering experienced by any sentient being. Quite simply there would not be

any reason to be incensed about the existence of experience were suffering not a part of sentience.

Of course, it is possible to be opposed to sentience even if no suffering exists, but no one would have any motive to oppose it. The only argument against sentience that would really hold any water (if suffering did not exist) would be that life is pointless but that would not be a compelling argument to people who exist without experiencing suffering.

I really have no bone to pick with Inmendham other than what could really be chalked up to semantics. Assuming that we are going with my definition of what would constitute objective morals, ethics, oughts, obligations, etc., then Inmendham would agree that these things cannot be objective. Inmendham knows that reality is not dictated or determined or impacted by any notions of right or wrong or how things ought to be. Inmendham's argument is pretty simple, straightforward, and understandable; he says that our intelligence, which enables us to recognize that suffering is unnecessary and pointless, is what obligates us to alleviate and prevent suffering, but Inmendham knows that this obligation of which he speaks is not physically binding so from my perspective it is not useful to even bother utilizing the terms obligation or ought.

My only real points of contention with Inmendham

are over which words and phrases he chooses to use to convey the arguments. A lot of the terms and phrases he uses do not convey anything other than his subjective stance upon the issues and the quality of the arguments is worsened by the introduction of logical fallacies which could be easily circumvented or avoided by Inmendham not making the claim that suffering requires alleviation. We subjectively feel that it requires alleviation, but it is not a fact that suffering literally, physically, demands alleviation. Inmendham is aware of this as well but persists in wording the arguments in a logically fallacious manner.

As I said within On Efilism, the problem with the phrasing of the arguments is quite easy to rectify; all that Inmendham would need to do is discontinue his usage of the words objective, ought, obligation, etc., and state that he personally feels as though suffering ought to be eliminated because it is unnecessary, pointless and it is definitionally, and universally unpleasant. It is essentially the same argument without introducing the is-ought problem because with this phrasing there is no pretense that anything should objectively be done, i.e., in an absolute sense. It is stated as merely the perspective of an individual which is all it is in fact. The claim that suffering ought to be alleviated is, at bottom, merely an opinion. Efilism provides an accurate description of

reality but its prescription, that suffering ought to be eliminated and prevented, is simply an opinion; it is not a fact that anything ought to be done about anything, it is not a fact that the universe ought to be configured in any particular way other than however the fundamental characteristics of particles necessitate that it be (which is how reality always is in any event)*.

Lanza also spoke quite a bit about cultural values (memes) and their negative consequences. I do not disagree with any of his statements, but I would amend to them that although primitive man is arguably less deluded than those within civilized societies (because they haven't been introduced to and indoctrinated into accepting so many abstractions), technical development is needed for the majority of people to identify that we exist within a godless, meaningless, purposeless, functionless universe. Primitive man may have less philosophical garbage in his brain but he is far less likely to identify the truthfulness of nihilism.

Note:

* This, of course, is not to state that whatever configuration of reality currently exists is good or optimal or acceptable for ourselves, it is merely to

state that our notions of how things ought to be are of relevance only to ourselves and one another.

Conclusion:

I reject Lanza's hard anti-value stance because there is simply no reason to be concerned about sentience, about experience, if there exists no possibility of suffering. If all experiences are neutral or good, then the existence of sentience is inconsequential. If there is no pain involved in being ripped apart, burned, starved, etc. then it is whatever. Life would be pointless, purposeless, meaningless and functionless but it would not be bad, in fact, it could only be regarded as neutral in the worst evaluation and practically every sentient being would say that life under these conditions is absolutely good.

I appreciate Lanza for presenting essentially the same arguments as Inmendham without making use of logically fallacious phrasing but his anti-value extremism is pretty nonsensical.

Solutions to Suffering

Within On Efilism, I have already addressed why omnicide is the optimal solution to the problem of sentient suffering upon the Earth so within this essay, I am going to be addressing how omnicide could be carried out without inflicting a great deal of suffering. I am also going to discuss why individuals or small groups killing themselves or others is ineffective at eliminating suffering and counter-productive for any movement which advocates for omnicide as a solution to the problem of suffering.

We will begin on the smaller scale, so I will discuss in what way individual or group killings are ineffectual. Individual or group killings do not significantly reduce or prevent suffering because the total population is determined primarily by resource availability. Hypothetically, if the working class within the USA are collectively in possession of about one hundred billion USD of disposable income per year, which they can dedicate to children, then we can expect the USA to produce a generation of working class children whose existence costs around one hundred billion per year to maintain. For the sake of simplicity, let us say that all external aid (such as government programs) are already factored

in and that the financial burden of working class children cannot exceed one hundred billion USD per year. Well, it obviously follows that the financial cost (of raising this generation of children) could only be equivalent to/or less than the full one hundred billion.

Resource availability will always be the primary determinant of population size. If half of the population willingly abstain from procreating and the resource availability does not change, i.e., the parents have one hundred billion USD to spend per year upon children, then the next generation will be capable of supporting more offspring per parent than their grandparents were able to support because within the generation to which they belong the number of parents is smaller. So the population remained the same in the long-run in spite of a short-lived ebb.

Outside areas of human habitation resources are free for the taking. Brute force determines which specific individual (which robin or squirrel or wolf, etc.) will consume whatever resource.

Conversely, within advanced human societies, resources cannot be legally taken through force. The implications of this as regards breeding should be readily apparent. Within the modern world, if half of the population chose not to procreate, then the population must decrease because the resource

availability has fallen because the quantity of disposable income available for sustaining the lives of the next generation has actually shrunk. The resources available to spend upon creating the next generation have shrunk because the resources of the half who chose not to procreate cannot be seized through brute force and devoted to financing the next generation. Furthermore, the resources of these people, after they have died, will not necessarily fall into the hands of those who have already or who intend to reproduce. Those who abstain from procreation have the option to leave their resources to any number of organizations or persons who will not utilize the resources in a way which will (directly or indirectly) support the existence of the next generation.

As a brief aside, it is worth noting that a decrease in the size of the workforce obliges capitalists to vie for manpower by increasing wages. A decrease in the size of the workforce does hurt total human productivity, total product output, but the scarcity of laborers compels capitalists to remunerate laborers at a higher wage. So, although total productivity (number of buildings constructed, miles of asphalt paved, number of automobiles manufactured, etc.) has fallen, the proletariat, under the aforesaid conditions, are entitled to a larger proportion (and

even potentially a larger quantity of finished goods) than were the previous, more numerous, generations of the proletariat.

Let us call the generation in which half of the population abstained from breeding generation 3 and the next is obviously generation 4. So, although the resources (the property) of the members of generation 3 who abstained from procreating will not necessarily fall into the hands of the members of generations 3 and 4 who intend to (or already have) reproduced the improved purchasing power of generation 4 (due to the scarcity of laborers) will, to some extent, "correct" for the high abstention rate of generation 3 and produce a sizable 5^{th} generation; unless, of course, generation 4 also abstain.

Governments have engineered a solution to the problem of population decline (due to an unwillingness to breed) in the form of tax-funded social programs to offset the financial burden of rearing children. Those who do not procreate are legally obligated to finance the procreation and rearing of the next generation.

To return to the earlier hypothetical of the American working class being in possession of one hundred billion USD of disposable income per year, which could be dedicated to rearing children let us say that half of the working class are not interested

in raising children and let us say that they are in possession of exactly half of the hundred billion. So, fifty billion in disposable income is all that can be put towards rearing children. If the government perceives that the situation is dire and in need of correction (if the workforce needed to maintain society as it currently is is projected to become insufficient due to abstention from procreation) then they will implement programs to more heavily burden the childless and alleviate the burden of parents. So, the government may take 10 billion from the childless (in the form of taxes) and hand it over to parents (in the form of programs). Within developed nations today, if the childless die (and if they have no one who could claim the money) then the government will take it and use it to finance all number of government programs including those which finance the existence of children.

All this to say that eliminating any number or proportion of individuals (short of 100%) will not result in an end to suffering because the survivors will replenish the population and the population will grow to whatever level available resources can sustain. So, eliminating individual humans, groundhogs, sparrows, crocodiles, etc. will not bring an end to suffering upon the Earth.

Ending life certainly eliminates all capacity to

experience for those whose lives are ended. Killing me would certainly end all capacity I have to experience anything (including suffering), so for me, it is a complete and perfect solution but it is not a solution for anyone else. Eliminating cat number 293,701,442 would be a perfect and complete solution for that particular cat but it would not do anything to end suffering for anything else, this is obvious.

It is in the interest of the sufferers for their suffering to be alleviated and prevented. Humans are a tiny proportion of sufferers, of sentient beings, so any proposed solution which does not concern itself with the alleviation of non-human animal suffering is incomplete. Of course, one could simply state that they are unconcerned with non-human animal suffering but as discussed within On Efilism, there is no good basis for distinguishing human from non-human suffering; we are all biological machines.

Extinguishing the lives of sentient beings is always best in the sense that their capacity to experience suffering (and really experience whatever) has been ended; suffering is always prevented by ending sentient lives. However, as shown above, a large scale solution is needed because other sentient animals will utilize whatever resources have been freed up by eliminating whatever number of sentient beings. Only a complete solution could completely

prevent and alleviate suffering. Only omnicide (universal killing), universal elimination, can provide a complete and permanent solution to the problem of suffering. Within On Efilism, I have already discussed why omnicide is the solution and so I will not go into detail regarding alternative proposals to completely eliminate and prevent suffering.

I do not condemn individual or group slaughter on the grounds that it is wrong or produces more suffering than it alleviates because morality is a fiction and there is no means of verifying that eliminating X individual will actually produce a world with less suffering, it is entirely possible that X individual will genuinely alleviate a great deal of suffering in some way, conversely, it is also possible that person X will contribute a great deal to the woe within the world, which is why we must remain ambivalent, unless we have a great deal of information about the specific individual(s) to be eliminated.

In any event, I do not regard it as a harm for a person to be painlessly eliminated, it is, in fact, in their best interest to be painlessly eliminated at the earliest possible time whether they agree with or acknowledge that or not. Painlessly eliminating a sentient being could only be regarded as a harm insofar as that individual would have prevented or

alleviated more suffering than their existence would have caused and in that their passing will cause distress for other sentient beings. The distress that other sentient beings experience as a result of the death(s) of those that they care for are simply a product of ignorance; if those sentient beings were capable of identifying that life is a curse (as it is the sole arena of suffering), then they shouldn't be capable of being distraught over the deaths of those for whom they care.

As regards individuals or groups carrying out the slaughter of other individuals or groups (for the sake of alleviating or preventing suffering), I condemn it only on the grounds that said acts will negatively impact the communication of the efilist arguments to the rest of humanity. There is nothing intrinsically "wrong" with painlessly eliminating any number of people; if there is no suffering there is no harm. The prevention of suffering (by eliminating whoever) is probably far greater than the infliction of suffering which will follow as a consequence of their demise.

Now that I have established the need (at least it is a need for those who are interested in alleviating and preventing all suffering) for a complete solution, we may discuss means of carrying out omnicide.

It seems to me that the most effective means of

ensuring that omnicide is carried out is by removing the base of the food chain. All sentient life upon the Earth depends upon photosynthetic organisms for sustenance. Photosynthetic organisms produce all of the calories which are bio-available for all eukaryotes. If the base of the Earth food chain (photosynthetic life) is removed then omnicide is guaranteed. If photosynthesis is impossible then there are not any bio-available calories for complex life. So, carrying out omnicide on Earth is simply a matter of ensuring that photosynthesis cannot occur.

Briefly, I suppose I will address the concern that some will have that sentience may re-emerge before the Earth becomes uninhabitable for sentient life. If we eliminated all photosynthetic life (and consequently all eukaryotic life) all that would remain would be microbes surviving from bio-available nutrients around hydrothermal vents. As explained earlier sentience arises because motile organisms receive a survival advantage through experiencing positive and negative stimulation as a result of different stimuli. No survival advantage is provided to a stationary organism which is not obliged to amble about in search of nutrients.

Chemosynthetic organisms are motile, and yes, they will cannibalize one another for nutrients, but the fact that the nutrients are not available over widely

dispersed areas (unlike sunlight which is obviously available all over the Earth over the course of twenty four hours) means that the chemosynthetic organisms do not benefit from motility to nearly the same extent as our cannibalistic microbial ancestors did. Furthermore, chemosynthetic microbes, as a result of chemosynthesis itself, have very little energy available to them, such that the probability that these organisms could evolve into something complex, let alone sentient, is unlikely. Photosynthesis is a requirement for the emergence of complex life upon the Earth.

I would propose that the most effective means of eliminating all photosynthetic life upon the Earth is to develop artificial clouds. I am no engineer, but we could certainly develop some chemicals that could be used to block out the majority of sunlight for years. We could set up facilities that automatically release a certain quantity of these chemicals, probably some sort of aerosol, each day for decades. We could spend a few years building up reserves of the chemicals so that the machines can release the chemicals for even centuries after our species is extinct if the need to do so is strongly felt.

Good and Bad

Attempts at defining what is good, correct, right, proper or bad, incorrect, wrong, improper about anything (including thoughts, actions, circumstances, etc.) have not provided any useful or truthful conclusions or descriptions because the majority of people who make use of these terms and who consider these issues have a delusional conception of reality. The majority who take the time to consider what is good or bad, right or wrong, etc. are basing their assessments of what constitutes good and bad upon fictions like morality, ethics, religious dogma, etc. and consequently fail to identify that they are ultimately simply stating their opinions upon these matters and are not reaching any factually correct, i.e. true, conclusions about how reality is.

A useful or true attempt at identifying what constitutes good and bad, right and wrong, etc., would begin by acknowledging that experience is subjective and that the cosmos is not defined, determined, impacted by the notions, or experiences of sentient beings. Nothing is objectively good or bad, right or wrong, proper or improper, etc. these are all subjective valuations generated by brains.

Pleasure and pain exist and definitionally it is factually correct to state that suffering is objectively

bad for the experiencer, for the sufferer; if it is not a fact that the subjective experience is unpleasant, painful, etc. for the experiencer then it cannot be regarded as suffering. So it is a fact, it is objectively true, that definitionally, the subjective experience of suffering is bad for the sufferer. However, it is not true that the experience itself is objectively bad, i.e. it is only true to state that it is bad (which is a subjective valuation) for the sufferer because these subjective valuations are not relevant to reality at large; that is to say that good and bad are terms of significance only to (and in relation to) sentient beings and are thus subjective.

Suffering, pain, and bad are all synonymous, and thus, interchangeable. Things that we regard as psychologically or physically painful are bad and "cause suffering" (more accurate to simply call them examples of suffering), and conversely, the things which we regard as examples or causes of suffering are physically or psychologically painful, unpleasant, distressing, bad, etc. Happiness, pleasure, and good are all synonymous, and thus, interchangeable in the same manner and for the same reason that suffering, pain, and bad are synonymous.

The circumstances and events which we regard as good or bad, right or wrong are those which bring us pleasure or pain respectively. This is so even if the "good" or "morally right" event or circumstance

causes us some measure of pain; the price in suffering to bring about x event or circumstance is less than the suffering which would be experienced if x did not occur. People withstanding torture in order to prevent others from being harmed are a good example because they clearly feel as though their own suffering whilst enduring the torture is less intense than the suffering that they would experience if they were to allow others to be harmed; the pain of the torture is not as severe as the pain of the guilt or so they imagine anyway.

Instances of self-sacrifice are selfish in that the person who sacrifices themselves feels as though the suffering will be less intense than existing within a world in which they did not sacrifice themselves; this is so even if they are not aware that they are operating in this way, they may convince themselves that the sacrifice is "right" but what they imagine to be right is ultimately whatever will produce the least suffering or produce the most pleasure for themselves even if it is at a cost to themselves as is the case with self-sacrifice.

What we regard as good and bad really can be boiled down to what brings us (personally) pleasure or pain. The suffering, the self-sacrifice, of a person which is needed to bring about or to prevent x event or circumstance in order to prevent the suffering of/or in order to increase the pleasure of person(s) y

does nothing to dismiss the argument because, as stated previously, any degree of self-sacrifice, of "purely altruistic" behavior which seemingly benefits only others is ultimately selfish and for the benefit of the "selfless" because they are minimizing their own suffering and or experiencing pleasure by behaving "selflessly" either by preventing harm to those that they care for or by improving their life conditions.

Even the most moral, ethical, virtuous, altruistic, good, etc. actions are carried out only for the benefit of the perpetrator; that is to say that the perpetrator is neurologically configured so as to either receive pleasure from self sacrifice or to suffer more (from guilt for instance) by allowing others to suffer than if they themselves were to suffer. Some people are neurologically configured so as to prevent their own suffering and increase their own happiness through instrumentalizing others by suffering on their behalf. In fact, most people are configured in this way to some extent. Almost all parents will sacrifice a great deal for their offspring and it is only for their benefit inadvertently; if the parents did not receive pleasant neurological stimulation (after suffering for the benefit of their children), then they would not continue to do so. If all of the "selfless" charity workers upon the Earth received no pleasant neurological stimulation for their "selfless" deeds,

then they would cease their charity work in short order. The beneficiaries of the actions of the "altruistic", "selfless", etc., are merely tools to enable these people to receive pleasure or experience less suffering.

An authentic, factual, basis for labeling events, circumstances, etc., as right or wrong would begin with the facts of pleasure and pain. Does X event or set of circumstances create (or possess the potentiality to create) more suffering than event or circumstance Y? All considerations can genuinely be reduced to calculations of pleasure and pain.

There is no need to introduce ethical, moral, religious, philosophical, etc., into the discussion, we can simply discuss what sort of future would have the least possible suffering and ask how we can bring that about.

Miscellany

Suffering exists only because blind natural forces produced a world in which chemicals were able to replicate themselves, and then those chemicals began to compete and so only the most effective replicators or survivors contributed to the next generation. Suffering exists only because within the context of biological warfare it became advantageous for the organism to be punished or motivated by stimuli. So suffering exists because blind natural forces produced a more effective replicator or survivor, i.e., warrior, gladiator, soldier, etc., in the arena or battlefield that is Earth.

Life is most accurately defined as a protracted pursuit to satiate, fulfill, insatiable, or unfulfillable wants. Only through death does the compulsion to satiate or fulfill these wants, desires, or needs disappear.

Formative Events and Truth

Many truth claims are ignored, dismissed without consideration, because the ignorant assume that a particular event or series of events are responsible for people accepting and espousing whatever position. Pessimistic assessments are often ignored because people believe that pessimists are only as they are due to formative events and so their views are not worthy of being heard, assessed, considered, etc., because they are simply a byproduct of negative, harsh, cruel, abusive, etc. past or present circumstances and/or events.

Ignoring arguments upon the basis that the formulator or espouser of the argument only believes x to be true due to the experiences which they have had is quite stupid as this could serve as adequate justification for ignoring every statement made by any sentient being; we are all the products of circumstance, our perspectives upon reality are shaped by our past experiences and present conditions. It is also quite stupid in that a person only realizing the truth of a claim after undergoing a particular experience (or series of experiences) does nothing to prove or disprove the factuality of the claim. The experience(s) which compelled a person to believe claim x has no bearing upon the factuality

of claim x.

Undergoing hardship in order to become capable of identifying x as true has no bearing upon whether or not x is factually correct or not, i.e., whether or not x is true or false. E.g., a person needing to experience hardship in order to see how harsh life is for sentient organisms does nothing to prove or disprove the claim that life is inextricably replete with suffering for the majority of sufferers upon the Earth.

All notions (including knowledge which are simply notions which comport with reality) are products of experience; products of either our own experience or the experience of others which have been communicated to us. The facts we know about the world and the perceptions or conceptions which we have of it (both true and false) are all products of either our personal experiences or they are adopted from others with experience. We know only what we know about various celestial bodies because of the experiences of astronomers, physicists, engineers, astronauts, etc.

Our species possesses such a fine and thorough understanding of reality due solely to our intelligence and the development of means of transmitting information across several generations. We have only developed the means of communicating information through experience and we have only been capable

of refining and expanding our understanding of reality due to our ability to endlessly expand our stores of information, an ability which itself was made possible only by language and means of storing and transmitting information across time.

Only as of the 20th century have we developed a sufficient understanding of reality to compel substantial numbers of people to abandon the delusional notions that our reality is the product of a creator, that humanity is special, that life possesses purpose, meaning, value, etc., that the universe possesses purpose, meaning value, etc., that an afterlife exists, that souls exist, etc.

In order to see things as these really are, one must abandon these deluded notions, one must remove the scales from their eyes. Only now has it become possible to convey an accurate view and understanding of reality to a sizable portion of the population. The experiences, the intellectual development, of humanity were a requirement for conceptualizing a factually accurate understanding of reality and more specifically of the sentient condition.

To claim that an argument or perspective can be dismissed because a person has been shaped by their experiences is preposterous because all notions (even verifiable facts) are the products of experience and experience is needed to form an accurate conception

or perception of something. We possess an accurate understanding of how our species came to be as it is (from aquatic fish which lived hundreds of millions of years ago) due solely to the experiences of researchers.

Non-human animals are not "less deluded" for their inability to understand the notions which we form; a dog is not "less deluded" than a human for not understanding how the Earth orbits the sun. Non-human animals are simply less intelligent and less informed. If non-human animals were as intelligent as ourselves and capable of understanding the information which we convey to them (and if they did not fall for delusional garbage like belief in the supernatural) then they would identify that life is the sole arena for suffering, that the suffering is pointless, and that alleviating suffering is in the interest of the sufferers.

The sentient condition has never changed and some extremely insightful people of the past identified (even in times and places in which everyone else were steeped in delusional notions such as god, soul, afterlife, purpose, meaning, etc.) that life is of negative value, that nonexistence is preferable to existence, that to have never been conceived or born is best, that life has no purpose, meaning, value, etc.

The intellectual development of our species has

been a process of discarding delusions and forming accurate conceptions of how things really are and how they came to be. As we have tossed out more garbage we have been enabled to see things for what they are. Information, borne of experience, has freed us from old delusions (which were themselves borne of experience) and for the first time the majority of humanity are capable of being informed of how things are in reality. The facts regarding how we came to be, the sentience of non-human animals, what "consciousness" is, etc. are all available.

Experience is needed to formulate any notion regarding anything. That a person has a notion about something as a consequence of their experiences does not invalidate (disprove the factuality of) their notion. Those who claim that our reality the product of a creator, that life has meaning, purpose, value, etc. need to substantiate their claims because they are the ones making positive claims (they are the ones claiming that reality has aspects and characteristics which it does not appear to have) and the claims which they are making are not concordant with the facts which are currently available.